

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
REGION 26**

**KIMBERLY-CLARK CORPORATION**

Employer

and

**Case 26-RC-8256**

**UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS,  
ARKANSAS REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Petitioner

**DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION**

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, a hearing was held before a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board; hereinafter referred to as the Board.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the Act, the Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to the undersigned.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the undersigned finds:.<sup>1</sup>

1. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

2. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act and it will effectuate the purposes of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Petitioner involved claims to represent certain employees of the Employer.

4. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c)(1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

5. The following employees of the Employer constitute a unit appropriate for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.<sup>3</sup>

**Included:** All full time integrated maintenance technicians, mechanical and electrical maintenance employees.

**Excluded:** All production workers, integrated maintenance technician trainees, maintenance assistants, operators, which includes line leaders, technicians, safety and training coordinators, truck drivers, office clerical, professionals, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

**Employees identified as planners will be allowed to vote subject to challenge.**

### **DIRECTION OF ELECTION**

An election by secret ballot shall be conducted by the undersigned among the employees in the unit found appropriate at the time and place set forth in the Notice of Election to issue subsequently, subject to the Board's Rules and Regulations. Eligible to vote are those in the unit who are employed during the payroll period ending immediately preceding the date of this Decision, including employees who did not work during that period because they were ill, on vacation, or temporarily laid off. Also eligible are employees engaged in an economic strike which commenced less than 12 months before the election date and who retained the status as such during the eligibility period and their replacements. Those in the military services of the United States Government

may vote if they appear in person at the polls. Ineligible to vote are employees who have quit or been discharged for cause since the designated payroll period, employees engaged in a strike who have been discharged for cause since the commencement thereof and who have not been rehired or reinstated before the election date, and employees engaged in an economic strike which commenced more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced. Those eligible shall vote whether or not they desire to be represented for collective bargaining purposes by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, Arkansas Regional Council.

### **LIST OF VOTERS**

To ensure that all eligible voters have the opportunity to be informed of the issues in the exercise of their statutory right to vote, all parties to the election should have access to a list of voters and their addresses that may be used to communicate with them. *Excelsior Underwear*, 156 NLRB 1236 (1966); *NLRB v. Wyman-Gordon Co.*, 394 U. S. 759 (1969). Accordingly, it is directed that an eligibility list containing the **full** names and addresses of all the eligible voters must be filed by the Employer with the Regional Director within 7 days of the date of this Decision. The Regional Director shall make the list available to all parties to the election. No extension of time to file the list shall be granted by the Regional Director except in extraordinary circumstances. Failure to comply with this requirement shall be grounds for setting aside the election whenever proper objections are filed. *North Macon Health Care Facility*, 315 NLRB 359 (1994). In order to be timely filed, such list must be received in the Memphis Regional Office (Region 26), 1407 Union Avenue, Suite 800, Memphis, Tennessee 38104, on or before **June 8, 2001**.

## **RIGHT TO REQUEST REVIEW**

Under the provision of Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, a Request for Review of this Decision may be filed with the National Labor Relations Board, addressed to the Executive Secretary, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20570-0001. This request must be received by the Board in Washington by **June 15, 2001**.

**DATED** at Memphis, Tennessee, this 1st day of June, 2001.

*/S/*

---

Ronald K. Hooks, Director Region 26  
National Labor Relations Board  
1407 Union Avenue, Suite 800  
Memphis, TN 38104-3627  
tel:901-544-0018

---

<sup>1</sup> The Employer and Petitioner have filed timely briefs which have been duly considered.

<sup>2</sup> The parties stipulated that Kimberly Clark Corporation is a Delaware corporation which operates a number of facilities, including the one at Conway, Arkansas, that is involved in this proceeding. During the past twelve (12) months, a representative period, the Employer has purchased and received raw materials valued in excess of \$50,000.00, which materials were shipped directly to the Employer's Conway, Arkansas facility from supplier locations outside the State of Arkansas. During the same representative period the Employer sold and shipped finished goods valued in excess of \$50,000.00 from its Conway, Arkansas facility directly to customer locations outside the State of Arkansas.

---

<sup>3</sup> By its petition in this matter, the Petitioner seeks to represent a unit of all electrical and mechanical maintenance employees, excluding all supervisors, office personnel, guards, production workers and planners at the Employer's Conway, Arkansas location. The Petitioner does not seek to represent the 220 line operators, 65 line leaders, 7 process specialists, 4 maintenance assistants, 24 Integrated Maintenance Technician (IMT) trainees, 8 department coordinators, nor the 4 co form console employees. The Employer seeks their inclusion because, it argues, the integration of the maintenance and operations functions makes this the smallest appropriate unit; or, alternatively, that a maintenance only unit would violate the Board's community of interest standards.

The petition filed May 3, 2001, in this matter reflects that the Petitioner specifically requested the exclusion of the planners from the unit. The record reflects that the Employer was asked to delineate the additional employee groupings that it was requesting be included in the unit. The record further reflects that the Employer responded, "Sure. We're saying that the process specialist, a group of people called IMT and IMT Trainees, maintenance assistants, and then operators, which includes line leaders, technicians, safety and training coordinators" (be included). The record also reflects that the Hearing Officer listed the specific job classifications and the number of employees in each classification at the end of the hearing to ensure the record accurately reflected the number of individuals the Employer sought to have included in the unit. That list did not include planners and the Employer did not request that they be added to the list. The record reflects that the Employer did not request at any point to have the planners included in the bargaining unit. The Employer contends there is some confusion about whether the Petitioner, by stating that it was seeking everyone on the

---

Maintenance Seniority List, had changed its position to include the planners. The Maintenance Seniority List contains 108 names in the classifications of mechanical maintenance and electrical maintenance but does not identify which individuals in these classifications are also designated as planners. The record contains insufficient evidence to establish whether there is a sufficient community of interest that would mandate the planners inclusion. Although the record does not indicate the specific number of planners, it is apparent from the record that the number is sufficiently limited to allow them to vote by challenge. Therefore, planners will be allowed to vote subject to challenge.

The Employer produces consumer products ranging from Huggies Diapers to Kleenex Tissue. The Conway, Arkansas facility makes products for feminine and adult care, such as tampons, feminine care pads, and adult care pads. It has four primary operating departments: Pad One Department makes feminine care pads. Pad Two Department makes adult care pads. The Tampon Department makes tampons. The Manufacturing and Support Services Department makes raw materials for other processes, i.e. the raw materials that become a baby wipe. The other departments are Technical Services, which is comprised of engineers; Maintenance, which is comprised of shift electricians, shift mechanics, line electricians, line mechanics, mechanics, electricians, IMTs, planners and support; and Shared Resources, which is finance and planning.

The shift electricians, shift mechanics, line electricians, line mechanics, mechanics, electricians and IMTs within the Maintenance Department are all supervised by either the electrical team leader, the mechanical team leader, the PM/focus

---

(Preventive Maintenance) team leader or the facility support stores team leader. Maintenance Team Manager Rick Glenn supervises the entire Maintenance Department and all shift electricians, shift mechanics, line electricians, line mechanics, electricians, mechanics, and IMTs.

The Employer's work force within the operations departments is divided into asset teams. Each asset team is comprised of an asset leader, an engineer, a process specialist, one or more line mechanics, one or more line electricians, line leaders and technicians. The line mechanics and line electricians on each asset team are responsible for the preventive maintenance and breakdown maintenance for all of the lines operated by the asset team. An asset team may be responsible for two to five production lines.

For example, in the Tampon Department one asset team is responsible for five operating lines. The team is responsible for the day-to-day operations of those lines - ensure the equipment is running, functioning and producing products. Within this team there is an asset leader, a mechanical engineer, an electrical engineer, a process specialist, a line mechanic, two line electricians, line leaders and technicians. The line electricians and line mechanic work with the asset team to keep the lines operating by doing routine maintenance and fixing any breakdowns. The line electricians and line mechanic spend 100% of their time performing maintenance work. They do not perform any line operations. The line electricians and line mechanic on the asset team interact with the other members of the asset team 80% of their time, while doing maintenance on the floor, attending asset team meetings and project meetings. Of this interaction time, 100% is maintenance oriented. When the line electricians and line mechanics

---

interact with the operators on the floor, it is to coach them through the minor maintenance tasks for which the operators have been trained. Line mechanics and line electricians are mechanics and electricians who have received long-term, non-permanent assignments to an asset team.

The line electricians and mechanics who work as part of asset teams remain in the Maintenance Department. They are not a part of the operations department to which the asset team belongs. The line electricians report directly to Jim Webber, the Electrical Team Leader. The line mechanics report directly to David McElroy, the Mechanical Team Leader. Both of the aforementioned team leaders are part of the Maintenance Department. The asset team leader merely gives direction on the maintenance of the asset operating lines. If the asset team leader has a discipline problem with a line electrician or line mechanic on his/her team, the asset team leader will discuss the problem with them. If the problem is not resolved, the asset team leader must go to either the Electrical Team Leader or the Mechanical Team Leader. The asset team leader may make recommendations and sit in on meetings, but is not free to discipline the line mechanics and line electricians on his/her team. Line electricians and line mechanics are required to work some plant shutdowns, although operations employees are granted excused absences for all shutdowns.

The shift electricians and shift mechanics are responsible for the breakdowns of machinery. They receive their assignments from the Shift Maintenance Team Leader and as calls come in over the radio during the shift. The shift electricians and shift mechanics do not perform any line operations. They work all plant shutdowns



---

All employees use the same break areas, follow the same sick and vacation policies and work on the production floor. All operations departments have scheduled breaks and lunch periods. However, the Maintenance Department does not have any scheduled breaks or lunch period. Each department schedules vacations and overtime separately. Maintenance has its own list for vacations that is determined by the Maintenance Seniority List. This list is maintained separate from the Mill Seniority list, which contains the names of all operations employees, including all those sought to be included in the unit by the Employer. The record reflects that the Maintenance Seniority List contains the names of the line electricians, line mechanics, shift electricians, shift mechanics, electricians, mechanics, and IMTs employed by the Employer. The Maintenance Department has its own overtime policy that is separate and distinct from that followed by the operations departments. Maintenance employees are not eligible for operations overtime. Nor are operations employees eligible for maintenance overtime. Maintenance employees also occupy the NE5 and NE5+ wage categories, the highest offered by the Employer.

There have been several instances of employees permanently transferring from operations into maintenance or from maintenance into operations. For example, employees have gone from mechanic to process specialist, or from line operator to mechanic. However, there are no instances of temporary interchange between operations and maintenance.

A two year technical degree or the equivalent experience is required to be hired as a line electrician, line mechanic, shift electrician, shift mechanic, electrician, mechanic, or IMT. This specialized training is not required for any of the operations

---

positions that the Employer seeks to have included in the unit. Operations employees are only required to have a high school diploma. Temporary workers are used to fill positions in operations. However, temporaries are not used to fill maintenance positions.

Integrated Maintenance Technician (IMT) is a newly created position. Those already hired into the position were transferred from the Maintenance Department and are required to have a two year technical degree or the equivalent experience. Those who will be chosen from operations to fill the twenty-four (24) IMT Trainee positions will be required to undergo a fourteen (14) month training program. This program includes 928 classroom hours at Pulaski Technical College and 1,472 hours of training within the Employer's Conway Mills facility. The IMT Trainees will not be placed on the Maintenance Department Seniority List until they have completed the training because it is not guaranteed that all twenty-four will complete the training.

Operations workers perform a variety of minor tasks which are also performed by maintenance workers. These tasks are a part of the TEC (Total Equipment Care) program begun in early 2000. This program teaches the operators to do minor maintenance once performed by the Maintenance Department. Members of the Maintenance Department conduct the TEC training. This training is divided into different sections. The training for TEC I lasts only three days. When Maintenance is called to a machine to do the minor maintenance tasks that are a part of TEC, they coach the operator through the task, rather than do it themselves. There are no prior qualifications necessary for the operators to take the class. The TEC Manual that lists the tasks for training is broken into sections by operating department. Every section of the handbook is captioned "Minor Maintenance". The record indicates that these minor maintenance

---

tasks include how to clean, grease, and trouble shoot the machines. The operators do not perform any electrical or mechanical maintenance repairs.

In determining whether maintenance workers may have a separate bargaining unit in a plant with no bargaining history, a community *of* interest analysis is utilized. It is Board policy, as set forth in ***American Cyanamid Co.***, 131 NLRB 909 (1961), to find separate maintenance department units appropriate in the absence of a more comprehensive bargaining history, where the facts *of* the case demonstrate that the maintenance employees involved have the requisite community of interest. In determining whether a sufficient separate community of interest exists, the Board examines such factors as mutuality of interests in wages, hours, and other working conditions; commonality of supervision; degree of skill and common functions; frequency of contact and interchange with other employees; and functional integration. ***Ore-Ida Foods, Inc.***, 313 NLRB 1016, 1019 (1994) *quoting Franklin Mint Corp.*, 254 NLRB 714, 716 (1981).

There is no comprehensive bargaining history at the Employer's Conway Mills facility. The Maintenance Department employees occupy the Employer's highest wage brackets, NE5 and NE5+. Shift maintenance employees work twelve (12) hour shifts. Line maintenance employees work eight (8) hour shifts. Both groups are expected to work plant shutdowns. They are also expected to report to work in the event a supervisor so requests. The Maintenance Department does not take scheduled breaks or lunch periods, as do those employees in operations. They also have a different overtime procedure. Only a supervisor in the Maintenance Department may discipline any of the electricians or mechanics. Even those assigned to an asset team may not be

---

disciplined by their asset team leader. All electricians, mechanics, and IMTs are required to have at least a two year technical degree or the equivalent experience. All spend 100% of their time performing maintenance tasks. There is frequent contact with employees in operations, but it is all in the course of performing maintenance tasks. There is no permanent interchange between operations and maintenance employees. While the line mechanics and line electricians are integrated as part of asset teams, their function remains totally distinct, as 100% of their time is spent on maintenance.

***E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Co.***, 162 NLRB 413 (1966) described the weight to be given to each factor:

The Board must hold fast to the objectives of the statute using an empirical approach to adjust its decisions to the evolving realities of industrial progress and the reflection of that change in organizations of employees. To be effective for that purpose, each unit determination must have a direct relevancy to the circumstances within which collective bargaining is to take place. While many factors may be common to most situations, in an evolving industrial complex the effect of any one factor, and therefore the weight to be given it in making the unit determination, will vary from industry to industry and from plant to plant. We are therefore convinced that collective-bargaining units must be based upon all the relevant evidence in each individual case. Thus we shall continue to examine on a case by case basis the appropriateness of separate maintenance department units, fully cognizant that homogeneity, cohesiveness, and other factors of separate identity are being affected by automation and technological changes and other forms of industrial advancement.

In ***DuPont***, the Board found that despite the integrated nature of the Employer's manufacturing process, the maintenance workers constituted an appropriate unit. In that case other employees performed the lesser skilled tasks of the electrical maintenance employees, similar to the TEC Program present here. However, only the electrical maintenance employees were required to progress through a three-year training program requiring classroom and on the job training. This is similar to the fourteen month IMT training and two-year technical degree or the equivalent experience required to become either an IMT or a maintenance employee at the Employer's Conway Mills.

---

Integration of a manufacturing process is a factor to be considered in unit determinations. But it is not in and of itself sufficient to preclude the formation of a separate craft bargaining unit, unless it results in such fusion of functions, skills, and working conditions between those in the asserted craft group and others outside it as to obliterate any meaningful lines of separate craft identity. *Id.* While the Employer's line electricians and mechanics work with operations employees, no such fusion of functions, skills and working conditions has occurred so as to obliterate the lines of separate craft identity.

There is no temporary interchange between operations and maintenance employees. In 1997, seven maintenance trainees were promoted to mechanics. In 1999, two employees were promoted from within operations to mechanical maintenance. In 2000, one employee was promoted from operations to become a mechanic in maintenance. Thus far in 2001, one employee has been demoted from process specialist to a position as a mechanic in maintenance. All of these instances of interchange within the Employer's facility are of a permanent nature. Operations employees do not fill in for maintenance employees. Thus, the interchange weighs less heavily on the community of interest. ***Franklin Mint Corporation***, 254 NLRB 714, 716 (1981).

The minor preventive maintenance work performed by operations employees does not require any specialized expertise, nor is it complicated. The operations employees do not have the expertise to perform, nor do they perform, work comparable to that performed by the mechanical and electrical maintenance employees. The Board has found that some overlap of lesser skilled duties does not preclude finding the

---

petitioned for unit appropriate. ***Burns And Roe Services Corp.***, 313 NLRB 1307, 1309 (1994) *quoting E. I. DuPont, Supra*. Thus, the minor maintenance tasks that are a part of the TEC Program do not preclude finding the petitioned-for unit appropriate.

The Employer argues that a separate maintenance unit is inappropriate and that ***U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers***, 174 NLRB 292 (1969) governs the unit decision here. In ***Plywood-Champion***, the lines of supervision were indistinguishable between maintenance and production. In the case of absences, maintenance employees would be assigned to perform production work and production employees frequently helped maintenance perform major repairs of the machinery.

Here, the lines of supervision are distinguishable. All maintenance employees, line and shift electricians and mechanics, and IMTs are directly supervised within the Maintenance Department. The Asset Team Leader has no authority to discipline the electricians and mechanics on his/her team. Further, there is no temporary interchange between the operations and maintenance work by the electricians and mechanics.

Indeed, the Employer also urges that the ***Plywood-Champion*** analysis be applied to include the line leaders, line operators and process specialists. There the Board stated that a separate maintenance unit was inappropriate because "any separate community of interests the maintenance employees might enjoy by reason of their skills and training has been largely submerged in the broader community interests which they share with the other employees, especially by reason of the common supervision in the performance of their usual tasks, the fact that production employees and maintenance employees perform some similar functions and frequently work together in the repair and maintenance of machinery, the line of progression from the

---

production department to maintenance department and the right of maintenance employees to "bump back" into the production work area in the event of a layoff, and the frequent assignment of maintenance employees to perform production work."

In this case, there is no common supervision, the operations employees do not perform similar functions, nor do they work together with maintenance to repair or maintain the machinery. Thus, ***Plywood-Champion*** is factually distinguishable and not controlling.

The Employer also cites ***F & M Schaefer Brewing Co.***, 198 NLRB 323 (1972) to support its contention that line leaders, line operators, and process specialists should be included in any appropriate bargaining unit. There the Board found that a maintenance-only bargaining unit was not appropriate because the employees shared integrated tasks, similar training and the same benefits, hours, pay and working conditions with the production employees. That case is also factually distinguishable. There, after a production employee informed maintenance of a malfunction in the machinery, the production employee would work alongside the maintenance employee until the problem was fixed. The maintenance employees who were working in the production unit were not only under the direct supervision of the production foremen, said foremen were able to discipline the maintenance employees and grant time off. There was also temporary interchange between maintenance and production whenever illness caused there to be a shortage of production employees. The maintenance department did not perform any major repairs. Outside contractors were utilized. Applicants for maintenance and production positions were given the same aptitude test,

---

required to undergo the same training and had the same benefits and working conditions.

Contrary to the Employer's contentions, the facts at issue are quite different from those in ***F & M Schaefer Brewing Co.***, thus rendering that case inapplicable.

The Employer further cites ***Chromalloy Photographic Industries***, 234 NLRB 1046 (1978) to strengthen its argument. This case, too, is factually distinguishable from the case at hand. There the camera repair and maintenance department were under the same supervision as the four departments that were not listed in the petitioned for unit. Nor was any previous experience, training or apprentice-like program necessary to apply for a position within the camera repair and maintenance department.

Here, the maintenance employees required qualifications are substantially different from the operations employees. Thus, ***Chromalloy*** is likewise distinguishable and not applicable to the facts at issue.

The Employer argues in the alternative that IMT trainees, line leaders, line operators, maintenance assistants, and process specialists are dual function employees and therefore should be included in the bargaining unit. ***Berea Publ'g Co.***, 140 NLRB 516 (1963); see also ***Marine Petroleum Co.***, 238 NLRB 931 (1978). However, the question addressed by the Board in those cases was whether particular employees who spent only a percentage of their time performing unit work were properly excluded from the unit. Neither case dealt with community of interest. These cases are not applicable as the record does not indicate that any of the employees at issue spend any time performing the work of maintenance employees as part of the Maintenance Department. Rather the record indicates that the employees at issue perform less skilled, minor



---

maintenance tasks as part of their duties within the various operating departments to which they belong.

The Employer argues that the IMT Trainees to be chosen in June of 2001 are apprentices as defined in Black's Law Dictionary and as such should be included in any bargaining unit found appropriate. However, the cases cited do not further the argument that the IMT Trainees should be included in an appropriate bargaining unit because they are apprentices.

The Employer cites *Display Sign Service, Inc.*, 180 NLRB 49 (1969) which deals with the question of whether student employees or part-time employees share a sufficient community of interest to entitle them to collective bargaining representation. The record does not reflect any part-time employees or student employees in either the unit sought by the Petitioner nor that argued to be appropriate by the Employer. The Employer also cites *Jollenbeck Tool & Die Co., Inc.*, 116 LRRM 1255 (1984). There the Board ordered the employer to bargain with the union over the effects of its plant closure on the bargaining unit. The Board did define the bargaining unit as including apprentices. However, *Jollenbeck* is not a representation case and thus does not answer a question concerning the appropriate unit. The union there had been designated as the collective bargaining representative for the unit since before 1975.

The future addition of the IMT Trainees warrants consideration of the expanding unit principle. This has as its objective the guarantee to current employees their right to select or reject a bargaining representative. *Toto Industries*, 323 NLRB 645 (1997). That right should not be unduly delayed.

---

Although the present case is distinguishable from **Toto** in that the IMT Trainees will come from within the facility and not be new hires, it is similar in that the identities of the IMT Trainees were not known at the time the petition was filed, will not be known at the time the Direction for Election issues, and further, will not be added to the Maintenance Department until they complete fourteen (14) months of training. Indeed, it is not definite that all twenty-four (24) selected will complete the training and become a part of the Maintenance Department.

The expanding unit principle requires the application of the "substantial and representative" test. The factors are: (1) the size of the present workforce; (2) the size of the employee complement who are eligible to vote; (3) the size of the expected ultimate employee complement; (4) the time expected to elapse before a full work force is present; (5) the rate of expansion, including the timing and size of projected interim hiring increases prior to reaching a full complement; (6) the certainty of expansion; (7) the number of job classifications requiring different skills which are currently filled; (8) the number of job classifications requiring different skills which are expected to be filled when the ultimate employee complement is reached; and, (9) the nature of the industry. **Toto Industries**, 323 NLRB 645 (1997).

Applying those factors here, the present unit sought by Petitioner at the representation hearing is approximately 105 employees. The Employer expects to add twenty-four people to the position of IMT. This would bring the total number of the expected unit to 129. The expansion is not definite. The record indicates that there is some doubt whether all twenty-four (24) will complete the fourteen (14) month training period. This is an existing job classification with established qualifications which will not

---

result in any change in the nature of the Employer's business. Upon completion of the training, the twenty-four will be added to twelve (12) people already designated as IMTs who are current Maintenance Department employees. Additionally, the complement of the current unit sought by Petitioner represents 82% of the unit total after the addition of the twenty-four IMT Trainees. Based on this analysis, the complement of employees in the petitioned for unit is sufficiently "substantial and representative" to order an immediate election without the inclusion of the IMT Trainees.

It is observed that there is nothing in the statute which requires that the unit for bargaining be the only appropriate unit, or the most appropriate unit; the Act only requires that the unit be "appropriate", that is, appropriate to insure to employees in each case "the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this Act." ***Overnite Transportation Co.***, 322 NLRB 723 (1996). The unit requested by Petitioner is an appropriate unit.

In light of the above, the evidence fails to establish that the 220 line operators, 65 line leaders, 7 process specialists, 4 maintenance assistants, 24 Integrated Maintenance Technician Trainees yet to be chosen, 8 department coordinators, and the 4 co-form console employees in question share a sufficient community of interest with the line electricians, line mechanics, shift electricians, shift mechanics, electricians, mechanics, and Integrated Maintenance Technicians to require their inclusion in the unit. I shall, therefore exclude these employees from the unit. There are approximately 105 employees in the unit found appropriate herein.

---

In accordance with Section 102.97 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, as amended, all parties are specifically advised that the Region will conduct the election when scheduled even if a Request for Review is filed, unless the Board expressly directs otherwise.

#### Classification Index

362-3325  
362-6709  
440-1720  
440-1760-1000